

From: Onnie Shekerjian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/28/02 11:09am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001

January 28, 2002

Dear Ms. Hesse:

The United States v. Microsoft Corporation litigation, which was brought nearly four years ago, should be ended with the consent decree by your Court.

Products which formed the basis for the Microsoft case in 1998 have since disappeared, becoming obsolete antiquities to be viewed with a smile and a "remember when" usually reserved for hula-hoops and RC Cola. Other issues at the core of the case have also changed almost unidentifiably or have been sold or merged with others.

The failed Microsoft Network is one of the best examples. It was part of the case in the beginning, but has since faded from the landscape as another of Microsoft's unsuccessful ventures. What's lost in the haze in the anti-trust argument is that Microsoft has probably experienced as many failures as successes, but instead of employing more attorneys to even the playing field by litigation, they employed more developers and more R&D folks.

It's clear that Microsoft's innovations over the past 25 years were not anti-competitive, witnessed simply by the robust software marketplace we have today. In fact, the products and platforms Microsoft offers continue to make other products possible, like educational and learning programs.

New products and consistently decreasing prices cannot be symptoms of a closed or anti-competitive marketplace. The cries of "monopolist!" against Microsoft, it turns out were an overreach.

More regulation will only damage one of the most promising industries in America. I hope you will sign off on the settlement agreement between Microsoft and the Justice Department and nine state attorneys general.

Sincerely,

Onnie Shekerjian
1301 East Myrna Lane
Tempe, Arizona 85284